

REMARKS

The present remarks are in response to the final Office Action dated June 12, 2008. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-7 and 9-17. The Applicant has currently amended Claims 1, 5, 6, and 14. In addition, the Applicant has added new Claims 18, 19, and 20. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, Claims 1-7 and 9-20 are currently pending and are believed to be in condition for allowance.

TELEPHONE CALL WITH EXAMINER

On or around August 21, 2008, the Applicant's attorney called the Examiner to suggest the current amendment to Claim 1. The Examiner understood the point raised and, barring a further search, would consider the amendment of Claim 1 with regard to the width of edge strips.

THREE MONTH EXTENSION OF TIME

Applicant requests a three month extension of time for filing a response to the Office Action. The required fee for the extension of time is submitted herewith.

REQUEST FOR CONTINUED EXAMINATION (RCE)

Applicant requests continued examination for the present Application. The required fee for the request is submitted herewith.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102 (b)

In the Office Action, Claims 1-7 and 10 were rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Patterson (GB 2294649A). The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection of Claims 1-7 and 10 under 35 USC §102(b).

With regard to Patterson, the Examiner has identified edge strips at 34. The edge strips of Claim 1 have limitations which prevent the application of end sections 13, 14 from Patterson as edge strips. As stated in Claim 1, the edge strips each being formed as mouldings in the form of generally tubular members which provide rigid side elements. Each tubular member having a longitudinal slot in one wall thereof into which the end edge regions of the filter cloth are inserted and retained by clamping means which press parts of the end regions of the filter cloths against the inner face of said slotted wall to either side of said slot. The clamping means having means bearing on the inner surface of a wall of the tubular member opposite to the slot. As shown above, end sections 13, 14 of Patterson do not meet the limitations of Claim 1. The Applicant emphasize the point that external metal channel 34 and end sections 13, 14 are clearly distinct elements of Patterson and cannot be used interchangeably when comparing the elements of Claim 1 and its dependent claims with Patterson. Furthermore, Patterson discloses the usage of a simple elongate clip 34 (external metal channel), and has no provision for protection of the pleated filter from the sides.

Independent Claim 1 has been amended for further clarification over Patterson. Claim 1 includes the limitation of “the edge strips 16,17 being at least as wide as the pleats formed in the filter clothes”. As stated in the specification,

The edge strips 16,17 are preferably wider than the pleats in the filter clothes and may be formed as mouldings which provide rigid side elements and the side elements are preferably reinforced by reinforcing members, such as rods or profiles, made from glass, carbon or synthetic fibre reinforced plastics.

The wide edge strips of the present application are intended to provide support and stability to the pleated cloths which results in more durability. Also, there is another purpose

The side members 16, 17 also are wide enough to prevent abrasion of the filter elements by particles entrained by air or other fluids incident from the sides.

The frame members are also shown as wider than the pleats in the filter cloths to provide support and stability which was outlined in new Claim 19. As stated in the specification,

The frame members are wider than the width of the pleats formed in the filter cloths 10, 11.

Based upon the amendment to Claim 1, the Applicant believes that Claim 1 is now in condition for allowance. Furthermore, since dependent Claims 2-7 and 10 are dependent from Claim 1, the Applicant believes that Claims 1-7 and 10 are in condition for allowance. Since Claims 2-7, 9-19 are pending and depend from Claim 1, these claims are also in condition for allowance.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103 (a)

Claims 9, 11, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Patterson in view of Reinstad (U.S. Patent No. 5,609,937). The Applicant respectfully disagrees that the Claims 9, 11, and 12 are unpatentable over Patterson in view of Reinstad.

With respect to Claims 9, 11, and 12, for similar reasons as stated above, Patterson is not an applicable reference, in addition, to the fact that Patterson lacks an indented part. Reinstad is also not an applicable reference. In contrast to the present application, Reinstad discloses a frame for a panel filter with an un-pleated

filter which may be a fibrous pad, stacked expanded metal foil sheets, or a strainer, and the frame grips the edges of the pad resiliently.

With respect to Claim 11 and 12, both Patterson and Reinstad are not applicable references as the Examiner points out. The Examiner states that a rectangular or trapezoidal shape to the edge strip would have been obvious. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. First, the purpose of the rectangular cross-section in Claim 11 is to increase the likelihood that the edge strip would be as wide as the pleats which is a significant feature of the present invention. As shown in Patterson, the edge strip 34 is not as wide as the pleats. Second, the Examiner does not properly address Claim 12 in its entirety. Claim 12 recites the following: A filter construction according to claim 9, wherein the edge strip provides a curved slotted wall with flanges extending beyond a generally trapezoidal sectioned part.

The Examiner incorrectly points to the “trapezoidal sectioned part” and states that this defines the shape of the edge strip. As shown in Fig. 9 of the present application, the trapezoidal sectioned part is member 56 which presses the edges of the filter cloths against the inner face of wall 54. In addition, this member 56 is not disclosed in Patterson or Reinstad. The Applicant suggests that there is no indication of any specific shape or size of the edge strip in Claim 12 and therefore the shape cannot be obvious. Therefore, the Applicant believes that the rejection for Claims 9, 11, and 12 should be withdrawn.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Patterson. The Applicant respectfully disagrees that Claim 13 is unpatentable over Patterson.

The Examiner suggests that the specific shape of the edge strip in Claim 13 would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. The Applicant believes that the shaped defined in Claim 13, which corresponds to Fig. 4 of the present

application, is not obvious. The Applicant believes that the specific arrangement of the edge strip provides for positive clamping of the ends of the filter cloths with the strip 33 in the side members. Therefore, the Applicant believes that the rejection for Claim 13 should be withdrawn.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Patterson. The Applicant respectfully disagrees that Claim 14 is unpatentable over Patterson. The Applicant has amended Claim 14 to further clarify Claim 14 over Patterson. Therefore, in light of this amendment, the Applicant submits that the rejection for Claim 14 be withdrawn.

Claims 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Patterson in view of Evans. The Applicant respectfully disagrees that Claim 15-17 is unpatentable over Patterson. The Examiner agrees that Patterson lacks the edge strip being complimentary. The Applicant believes that Evans is not an applicable reference for Claims 15-17 for the following reasons. In contrast to the present invention, Evans describes air filter panels incorporating edge frames 35 which embrace the edges of a multi layer filter element, of indeterminate type illustrated as a stack of rigid filter elements. Since Patterson is not an applicable reference and Evans, for the reasons stated above, the Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn for Claims 15-17.

New Claims 18, 19, and 20 are added and no new matter has been presented. Note, independent Claim 20 is a combination of Claims 1, 3, 5, and 19.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Claims 1-7 and 9-20 are currently pending and are believed to be in condition for allowance and the application ready for issue. Corresponding action is respectfully solicited.

The Director is authorized to charge any additional fees incurred as a result of the filing hereof or credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account Number 02-0900.

Respectfully submitted,

/daniel j. holmander/

Daniel J. Holmander, Esq.
Reg. No. 59,518

BARLOW, JOSEPHS & HOLMES, Ltd.
101 Dyer Street, 5th Floor
Providence, RI 02903
(401) 273-4446 (tel)
(401) 273-4447 (fax)
djh@barjos.com